



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/660,824      | 09/13/2000  | Alan Rowe            | 103.1046.01         | 7793             |

22883 7590 01/17/2006  
SWERNOFSKY LAW GROUP PC  
P.O. BOX 390013  
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94039-0013

EXAMINER

HOANG, PHUONG N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2194

DATE MAILED: 01/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                                      |                                   |  |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>09/660,824 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>ROWE, ALAN |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Phuong N. Hoang   | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2194           |  |

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/14/06.
- 2a)  This action is **FINAL**.                      2b)  This action is non-final.
- 3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4)  Claim(s) 1 - 11, 13 - 32, 34 - 42, amd 48 - 51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6)  Claim(s) 1 - 11, 13 - 32, 34 - 42, amd 48 - 51 is/are rejected.
- 7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a)  All    b)  Some \*    c)  None of:
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/23/01 & 11/1/00.
- 4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 – 11, 13 – 32, 34 - 42, and 48 – 51 are pending for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1 – 4, 8, 16, 21 – 25, 29, 37, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over French, US patent no. 6,341,312 in view of Kampe, Pub. No. US 20020002448.**

4. French was cited in the last office action.

5. **As to claim 1**, French teaches a method of operating a file server, comprising the steps of:

receiving a CIFS request at the file server (CIFS client access network devices located on servers, col. 3 lines 25 – 50);

recording a state at the file server at the time of the receiving the request (the per server session structure 58 maintains state information with respect to the server to which the user is connecting, col. 5 lines 1 - col. 6 line 10) the state including information regarding a persistent connection between the server and a client device;

restoring the state of the file server upon reboot as last recorded (reconnect without requiring the user to re-enter information, col. 5 and col. 6 lines 1 – 26);

attempting to continue the CIFS session between at least one client device and the file server that the request was part of (reestablish the connections, replays the connections, col. 6 lines 20 – 48).

French does not explicitly teach wherein the step of recording state further comprises the step of determining whether recovery will be accomplished by rebooting the affected server.

Kampe teaches the step of determining whether recovery will be accomplished by rebooting the affected server (after the components fail-overs have taken place and result in a node reboot, [0048 – 0049, 0054 – 0055, 0062, 0065] and figures 4 and 5)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching Kamp to French's system because Kampe would provide many solutions to fix the server when it is down.

6. **As to claim 2**, French teaches the steps of acknowledging receipt of the CIFS request; processing the CIFS request (session establishment request is stored ...."permanent", col. 6 lines 5 – 10).

7. **As to claim 3**, French teaches the step of recording state includes determining automatically whether the processing of a CIFS request is at a point where the state can be reliably recorded (it is inherent in maintaining the state information).

8. **As to claim 4**, French teaches the step of recording state occurs at points based on the progress of processing of a CIFS request (CIFS, col. 3 lines 25 – 50).

9. **As to claim 8**, French teaches the step of recording state further comprises the step of determining whether the server shutdown was elective or non-elective (an interrupt .... test outcome is negative or positive, col. 6 lines 10 – 20).

10. **As to claim 16**, see rejection for claim 12 above.

11. **As to claim 21**, French teaches the step of replaying the connection would be obvious the system continues to run and complete remaining portion of the uncompleted request.

12. **As to claim 22**, this is the apparatus claim of claim 1. See rejection for claim 1 above.

13. **As to claims 23 – 25**, see rejection for claims 2 – 4 above.

14. **As to claim 29**, see rejection for claim 8 above.
15. **As to claim 37**, see rejection for claims 16 above.
16. **As to claim 42**, see rejection for claim 21 above.
17. **Claims 5 - 7, 9 – 11, 13 – 15, 17 - 20, 26 - 28, 30 – 32, 34 – 36, and 38 – 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over French, US patent no. 6,341,312 in view of Kampe, Pub. No. US 20020002448, and further in view of Delaney, US patent no. 5,996,086.**
18. Delaney reference was cited in the last office action.
19. **As to claim 5**, French does not explicitly teach the step of wherein the state is recorded to a non-volatile storage.  
  
Delaney teaches the step of the information is stored in the non-volatile storage (the non- volatile storage of each server is used to store identification information, specific to the fail-over servers, col. 4 lines 42 – 65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of French and Delaney's system because the non-volatile memory storage is necessary for the server to maintain the system information when the power is off.

20. **As to claims 6 and 7**, French modified by Delaney teaches the steps of recording state occurs as part of an elective reboot (Delaney; fo\_mode\_stop, col. 7 lines 5 – 65 and col. 9 lines 55 - 65) or elective takeover of a server further comprising:

ignoring current CIFS requests (one of ordinary skill in the art can recognize that the current request should be temporarily ignored after the system shutdown and before trying to process all active requests);

processing all active CIFS requests (Delaney; resume messages, col. 9 lines 55 – 65);

recording state (French; col. 5 lines 35 – 42).

21. **As to claim 9**, French modified by Delaney teaches the step of determining whether the server shutdown is elective or non-elective is a function of a flag (test outcome, col. 6 lines 10 – 20) value stored in the non-volatile storage.

22. **As to claims 10 and 11**, French teaches the step of the flag value indicates the server shutdown was elective (positive or negative, col. 6 lines 10 – 20) or non-elective.

Art Unit: 2194

23. **As to claim 13**, French modified by Delaney teaches the step of recording state further comprises the step of determining whether recovery will be accomplished by rebooting the affected server (the machine is rebooted, col. 6 lines 40 – 45) is a function of the flag value (the test outcome, col. 6 lines 10 – 20) is stored in the non-volatile storage.

24. **As to claim 14**, French teaches the step of the flag value indicates the recovery will be accomplished by rebooting the affected server (if the outcome is positive, the routine reconnect the client to the server, col. 6 lines 15 - 45).

25. **As to claim 15**, French does not teach the step of wherein the flag value indicates the recovery will be accomplished by takeover by another server.

Delaney teaches the step of the flag value indicates the recovery will be accomplished by takeover by another server (flag fo\_mode\_fail\_over, col. 7 lines 5 – col. 8 lines 10).

It would have been obvious to combine the teaching of French and Delaney's system because Delaney would provide a back up server to keep the system up running and providing services when a system failure occurs.

26. **As to claim 17**, see rejection for claim 13 above.

27. **As to claim 18**, French teaches wherein the reboot comprises the steps of:



Art Unit: 2194

rebooting the affected server's operating system (the machine is rebooted, col. 6 lines 40 – 45); and

rebuilding in-memory data structures (inherent when the data structures is saved in a disk such that when the machine is rebooted, col. 6 lines 40 – 48) to the state prior to the reboot.

28. **As to claim 19**, French modified by Delaney teaches the step of wherein the rebuilding in-memory data structures further comprises fetching the state stored in the non-volatile storage (Delaney; non-volatile storage, col. 4 lines 42 – 65) to rebuild the in-memory data structures (French; inherent when the data structures is saved in a disk such that when ..... rebooted, col. 6 lines 40 – 48).

29. **As to claims 20**, French modified by Daleney teaches wherein the takeover (Delaney, failover, col. 8 lines 1 – 10) comprises fetching the stored in the non-volatile storage (inherent) and rebuilding the in-memory data structures in another server using the state (French; one of the ordinary skill in the art can recognize that the data structures has to be rebuild in the in-memory in another server that has to be server trusted).

30. **As to claim 26**, see rejection for claim 5 above.

31. **As to claims 27 – 28**, see rejection for claims 6 – 7 above.

32. **As to claim 30**, French modified by Delaney teaches the step of determining whether the server shutdown is elective or non-elective is a function of a flag (French; test outcome, col. 6 lines 10 – 20) value; the information is stored in the non-volatile storage (Delaney; the non- volatile storage of each server is used to store identification information, specific to the fail-over servers, col. 4 lines 42 – 65).

33. **As to claims 31 and 32**, French teaches the step of the flag value indicates the server shutdown was elective (positive or negative, col. 6 lines 10 – 20) or non-elective.

34. **As to claims 34**, see rejection for claim 13 above.

35. **As to claims 35**, see rejection for claim 14 above.

36. **As to claim 36**, see rejection for claim 15 above.

37. **As to claims 38**, see rejection for claim 17 above.

38. **As to claims 39 - 40**, see rejection for claims 18 - 19 above.

39. **As to claim 41**, see rejection for claim 20 above.

**40. Claims 48, 49, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delaney, US patent no. 5,996,086 in view of French, US patent no. 6,341,312.**

41. **As to claim 48**, Delaney teaches the non-volatile memory having storage capable of holding information, the information including the steps of:

Information identifying the state of a first device (status of the servers, col. 6 lines 19 – 25); and

information identifying a flag value, the flag value indicating a previous operating mode identifying an elective reboot of the first device to be affected (identification information includes a flag .... To be booted and fo\_mode\_stop .... operator requested reboot, col. 7 lines 5 – col. 8 lines 57).

Delaney does not teach the step of attempting to continue any active CIFS sessions.

French teaches the step of attempting to continue any active CIFS sessions (reestablish the connections, replays the connections, col. 6 lines 20 – 48 and col. and col. 3 lines 25 - 60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Delaney and French's system because French's CIFS session would provide an additional choice of protocols to the network for more flexibility and variety of means for accessing to the network system.

42. **As to claim 49**, Delaney teaches the non-volatile memory having storage capable of holding information, the information including the steps of:

Information identifying the state of a first device (status of the servers, col. 6 lines 19 – 25); and

information identifying a flag value, the flag value indicating a previous operating mode identifying an non-elective reboot of the first device to be affected (identification information includes a flag .... To be booted, and fo\_mode\_stop .... Detected failure, col. 7 lines 5 – col. 8 lines 57).

Delaney does not teach the step of attempting to continue any active CIFS sessions.

French teaches the step of attempting to continue any active CIFS sessions (reestablish the connections, replays the connections, col. 6 lines 20 – 48 and col. and col. 3 lines 25 - 60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Delaney and French's system because French's CIFS session would provide an additional choice of protocols to the network for more flexibility and variety of means for accessing to the network system.

43. **As to claim 51**, Delaney teaches the non-volatile memory having storage capable of holding information, the information including the steps of:

Information identifying the state of a first device (status of the servers, col. 6 lines 19 – 25); and

information identifying a flag value, the flag value indicating a previous operating mode identifying an non-elective takeover of the first device by the second device (identification information includes a flag, and fo\_mode\_fail indicates that the remote server has failed and its network services are being provided by another remote server, col. 7 lines 5 – col. 8 lines 10).

Delaney does not teach the step of attempting to continue any active CIFS sessions.

French teaches the step of attempting to continue any active CIFS sessions (reestablish the connections, replays the connections, col. 6 lines 20 – 48 and col. and col. 3 lines 25 - 60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Delaney and French's system because French's CIFS session would provide an additional choice of protocols to the network for more flexibility and variety of means for accessing to the network system.

**44. Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delaney, US patent no. 5,996,086 in view of Edmonds, US patent no. 6,397,345, and further in view of French, US patent no. 6,341,312.**

45. **As to claim 50**, Delaney teaches the non-volatile memory having storage capable of holding information, the information including the steps of:

information identifying the state of a first device (status of the servers, col. 6 lines 19 – 25); and

information identifying a flag value, the flag value indicating a previous operating mode (identification information includes a flag ....op\_mode, col. 7 lines 5 – col. 8 lines 57).

Delaney does not teach the step of the mode includes elective takeover, and attempting to continue any active CIFS sessions.

Edmonds teaches the step of an elective takeover of the first device by a second device (fail-over ... locate another server, col. 1 lines 40 - 60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Delaney and Edmonds's system because Edmonds's elective takeover step would provide the takeover server a choice to takeover the failed server, and to keep the system up running for efficiently.

Delaney and Edmonds do not teach the step of attempting to continue any active CIFS sessions.

French teaches the step of attempting to continue any active CIFS sessions (reestablish the connections, replays the connections, col. 6 lines 20 – 48 and col. and col. 3 lines 25 - 60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Delaney, Edmonds, and French's system because French's CIFS session would provide an additional choice of protocols to the network for more flexibility and variety of means for accessing to the network system.

### ***Response to Arguments***

46. Applicant's arguments filed on 10/14/05 with respect to claim 1 – 11, 13, 32, and 34 – 42 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, and with respect to claims 48 - 51 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

47. Applicant argued in substance that

(1) As to claims 48, 49, and 51, applicant does not see the flag in French indicates "reboot" or "takeover" of a device was either "elective" or "non-elective". Delaney does not teach a persistent connection mechanism. Applicant claimed an elective reboot while including flushing active CIFS requests and placing pending requests on hold as to claim 48. It is impermissible to consider that the combination of Delaney and French teach an elective shutdown while maintaining a persistent connection.

48. Examiner respectfully disagreed with applicant's remark

As to point 1, claims 48, 49, and 51 do not include a persistent connection mechanism and placing pending requests on hold. It is the combination of Delaney and French, not any alone, teaches the claimed limitation. Examiner did not cite French for teaching flag indicating "reboot" or "takeover" of a device was either "elective" or "non-elective". Examiner cited French for teaching the step of attempting to continue any active CIFS sessions (reestablish the connections, replays the connections, col. 6 lines 20 – 48 and col. and col. 3 lines 25 - 60). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Delaney and French's system because French's CIFS session would provide an additional choice of protocols to the network for more flexibility and variety of means for accessing to the network system.

### ***Conclusion***

49. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong N. Hoang whose telephone number is (571)272-3763. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 am to 5:30 pm.



Art Unit: 2194

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on 571-272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ph  
January 9, 2006



WILLIAM THOMSON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER